



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/566,962	01/26/2006	Bartel Marinus Van De Sluis	US030250US	9403

24737 7590 10/03/2008

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS

P.O. BOX 3001

BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

ADEYIGA, TEMITOPE A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2622

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/03/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/566,962

Applicant(s)

VAN DE SLUIS ET AL.

Examiner

TEMITOPE ADEYIGA

Art Unit

2622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 January 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 26 January 2006 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to the communication filed on January 26, 2006.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5, 7-10, 16-21, 26, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over (US 6954229) hereinafter referred to as Otala in view of (US 20030104841) hereinafter referred to as Yamamoto.

Claim 1 Otala discloses "An apparatus for viewing digital still photographs, the apparatus comprising: data input means for inputting at least one digital data file representing a digital still photograph, the at least one digital data file having at least one of a time and location stamp indicating a time when the photograph was taken or a location where the photograph was taken, respectively [Otala Column 7; lines 32-45]; a display for displaying the digital still photograph [Otala Column 7; line 65]; digital still photograph rendering means for inputting the at least one digital data file to the display for rendering of the corresponding digital still photograph on the display [Otala Column

4; lines 15-20];” Although Otala fails to disclose “ambient alteration means for altering an ambient characteristic based on at least one of the time and location stamps” the examiner maintains that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide “ambient alteration means for altering an ambient characteristic based on at least one of the time and location stamps”, as disclosed by [Yamamoto ¶0024 and ¶0050] for the purpose of intuitively displaying image data.

Claim 2 Otala discloses “the data input means is a media drive for reading the at least one digital data file from a media contained in the media drive.” [Otala Column 9; lines 54-62]

Claim 3 Otala discloses “the media drive is one of a CD player, DVD player, floppy drive, and digital camera media card reader.”

Claim 4 Otala discloses “the data input means comprises a modem operatively connected to one of a network, storage device, and digital still camera.” [Otala Column 4; lines 32-34]

Claim 5 Otala discloses “the data input means comprises a connector operatively connected through a cable to one of a network, storage device, and digital still camera.” [Otala Column 4; lines 32-34]

Claim 7 Yamamoto discloses “the ambient alteration means comprises a lighting system and the ambient characteristic comprises an ambient lighting in an area proximate the display.” [Yamamoto ¶0024 and ¶0050]

Claim 8 Yamamoto discloses "the lighting system changes the ambient lighting to reproduce a lighting characteristic of at least one of the time when the digital photograph was taken and the location where the digital photograph was taken." [Yamamoto Figure 5 ¶¶0024 and ¶¶0050]

Claim 9 Otala discloses "the ambient alteration means comprises an audio rendering system and at least one speaker operatively connected thereto and wherein the ambient characteristic comprises reproducing audio in an area proximate the display." [Otala Column 6; lines 32-42]

Claim 10 Otala discloses "the reproduced audio is characteristic of at least one of the time when the digital photograph was taken and the location where the digital photograph was taken." [Otala Column 6; lines 32-42]

Claim 16 is rejected as applied in the rejection of Claim 1.

Claim 17 is rejected as applied in the rejection of Claim 1, since the method is inherent to the apparatus of Claim 1.

Claim 18 is rejected as applied in the rejection of Claim 7, since the method is inherent to the apparatus of Claim 7.

Claim 19 is rejected as applied in the rejection of Claim 8, since the method is inherent to the apparatus of Claim 8.

Claim 20 is rejected as applied in the rejection of Claim 9, since the method is inherent

to the apparatus of Claim 9.

Claim 21 is rejected as applied in the rejection of Claim 10, since the method is inherent to the apparatus of Claim 10.

Claim 26 is rejected as applied in the rejection of Claim 7.

Claim 27 is rejected as applied in the rejection of Claim 9.

Claims 6, 11-15, and 22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Otala in view of Yamamoto as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Official Notice.

Claim 6 Otala and Yamamoto disclose the claimed invention except for "a connector wirelessly connected to one of a network, storage device, and digital still camera"; However Official Notice is hereby taken that it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide "a connector wirelessly connected to one of a network, storage device, and digital still camera", since wireless connection were well known at that time.

Claim 11 Otala and Yamamoto disclose the claimed invention except for "at least one other display in an area proximate the display, wherein the ambient characteristic comprises the at least one other display"; However Official Notice is hereby taken that it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide "at least one other display in an area proximate the display, wherein the ambient

characteristic comprises the at least one other display", since Otala discloses a grouping of files associated with an image which comprises multiple JPEG [Otala Column 6; lines 43-47]; so to provide multiple displays to view all associated data requires routine skill in the art.

Claim 12 is rejected similarly as applied in the rejection of Claim 11 since the associated data referred to in the rejection of Claim 11 reads on "a display on the one other display is representative of a historical period within the time when the digital photograph was taken."

Claim 13 is rejected similarly as applied in the rejection of Claim 11 since the associated data referred to in the rejection of Claim 11 reads on "a display on the one other display is representative of a geographical location where the digital photograph was taken."

Claim 14 Otala and Yamamoto disclose the claimed invention except for "the ambient alteration means comprises an advertisement generation means for generating at least one of an audio or visual advertisement on the at least one other display or a speaker operatively connected to the apparatus"; However Official Notice is hereby taken that it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide "the ambient alteration means comprises an advertisement generation means for generating at least one of an audio or visual advertisement on the at least one other display or a speaker operatively connected to the apparatus", since serving

relevant advertisements were well known at that time the invention was made.

Claim 15 Ojala and Yamamoto disclose the claimed invention except for "the one other display comprises a picture-in-picture display displayed on the display"; However Official Notice is hereby taken that it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide "the one other display comprises a picture-in-picture display displayed on the display", since picture in picture was a well known feature in display devices at the time the invention was made.

Claim 22 is rejected as applied in the rejection of Claim 11, since the method is inherent to the apparatus of Claim 11.

Claim 23 is rejected as applied in the rejection of Claim 12, since the method is inherent to the apparatus of Claim 12.

Claim 24 is rejected as applied in the rejection of Claim 13, since the method is inherent to the apparatus of Claim 13.

Claim 25 is rejected as applied in the rejection of Claim 14, since the method is inherent to the apparatus of Claim 14.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TEMITOPE ADEYIGA whose telephone number is (571)270-3578. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, NgocYen Vu can be reached on (571)272-7320. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/T. A./
Examiner, Art Unit 2622
09/18/2008

*/Ngoc-Yen T. VU/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2622*